

May 6, 2024

Hon. Magistrate Parker  
United State District Court, S.D.N.Y.  
500 Pearl Street, Courtroom 17D  
New York, NY 10007

**RE: renewed objection to validity of Stipulation**

**VIA:** electronic submission through *Pro-Se* Intake Unit and to chambers directly

Your Honor,

I am the *pro-se* Plaintiff in the above-mentioned matter, hereinafter referred to in first person or as “Plaintiff.”

This morning, I submitted an objection to chambers, copying Mr. Blumetti, noting that the stipulation for substitution of counsel, filed on Friday was invalid, as it did not list a signatory. About two hours later, a new Stipulation was filed.

The updated stipulation only makes a greater mockery of this case and the Court. Now, the Defendant-Campaign claims that the signatory is Justin Clark – ***who was an attorney for the Defendant-Campaign in 2020***. An attorney for an entity cannot sign as the entity. This is nothing short of absurd and incredibly improper. The Campaign will do anything and everything to hide the obvious – the “client” and the person/s making decisions are Mr. Trump and the 2024 Campaign.

Your Honor, it is clear that the Defendant-Campaign has caused chaos in this case in the last 10 days, and such is its intent. Plaintiff again asks that substitution of counsel – which is only permitted if the Court approves – not be permitted until the Defendant has complied with the production of the complaints that were due by *tomorrow*. ***There is no reason to permit this utterly-last-minute ‘swap’ mid-play, especially when the Court is aware that it would be prejudicial not only to Plaintiff but to the interests of honesty and justice.*** It is abundantly obvious the scheme that is occurring here, and Plaintiff respectfully requests that this honorable Court not permit such.

Plaintiff again renews her objection to this Court approving of the stipulation of substitution of counsel, given that there is no valid basis for agreeing to such, as the Court itself has stated that Defendants have not demonstrated there was, in fact, an irreparable breakdown with the client. Plaintiff requests that the Court not ratify this improper stipulation and, at the very least, set a hearing on such so that Plaintiff and argument may be heard. Mr. Blumetti can and should continue working on the case until then, given that he continues working on the case for the Defendant-Campaign in NY-state court – the same client with whom he claims there was an “irreparable breakdown” – but apparently not so much to render him unable to continue to work with said client on other cases.

Respectfully and humbly submitted,

s/Arlene Delgado  
Arlene Delgado  
Plaintiff, pro-se